

F230

S45

1850



0 014 442 789 0



Hollinger
pH 8.5
Mill Run F03-2193

F 230
.S45
Copy 1

SPEECH

OF

✓
MR. SEGAR,

OF ELIZABETH CITY AND WARWICK,

ON THE

ELECTION OF STATE OFFICERS,

DELIVERED IN THE

HOUSE OF DELEGATES,

WEDNESDAY THE 6TH AND TUESDAY THE 13TH FEBRUARY, 1850.

RICHMOND:

H. K. ELLYSON'S POWER PRESS, MAIN STREET,
OPPOSITE THE FARMERS' BANK.

1850.

F230
S45

SPEECH.

MR. SEGAR said he had risen, not so much to sustain the nomination of Mr. Heath, who for thirty years had honored and adorned the office of First Auditor, as to enter his protest against the *principle* on which it was proposed to exclude him. Gentlemen had shown great unwillingness to make confession of their principle of action; had seemingly shrunk from its avowal, as well they might, for on no consideration of public policy, of right, or of justice, could it be defended. The gentleman from Franklin had said "the thing was to be done, right or wrong," and because the dominant party "had the right to do it." The gentleman from Rockingham had put it on the ground that Mr. Heath was an active partisan, and had written a play burlesquing the Democracy; but the gentleman from Roanoke had "let the cat out the bag," manfully "faced the music," and placed the thing on the true basis—that of retaliation upon General Taylor for federal removals. If any doubt could exist on the subject, it would be at once removed by reference to the democratic presses in this city, which, from day to day, send forth strong party appeals for the removal of the Whig State officers, on the principle of the "*lex talionis*." Gentlemen could not disguise it:—it was nothing more nor less than a proposition to introduce, now for the first time, in Virginia, the doctrine of proscription—to rear for the first time, over the capitol of this proud Commonwealth, the flag of the "spoils;" and the argument to justify it was simply this: General Taylor has removed Democrats from federal offices; therefore, we, the Democrats, now in the ascendancy here, will proscribe the Whig officers in the basement story of the capitol.

A proposition more startling, he undertook to say, had never been announced in the legislative halls of Virginia. Here is a public functionary, holding an office purely ministerial, who came into the public service in the purer days of the Republic, when political opinion had nothing to do with appointment to, or removal from office. For long years he has discharged faithfully and satisfactorily the duties of his post. All admit, because none can deny, his superior fitness, moral and mental. We all know, from personal intercourse and observation, his vigilance, his promptness, his winning urbanity, and his entire competency. And yet it is proposed to displace him—not that a solitary being alledges him to be incompetent, unfaithful, or, in any respect, unworthy of public trust; *but that he is a Whig*, and that *his* removal, and that of other Whig incumbents of State office, are demanded as a measure of retaliation and revenge upon the Federal Executive.

Assuming, then, retaliation to be the principle of democratic action on the present occasion, he appealed to his democratic friends if, on so unsound and unsatisfactory a ground, they designed to introduce into Virginia a policy which would, he solemnly believed, be pernicious in all its aspects, and affix a lasting stain upon the character of the State? He utterly denied to the democratic party, here or elsewhere, the right

to avail itself of the law of retaliation. That law was one that belonged to the injured party, and to it only. The injuring party—the first offender—could never take rightly to itself the benefits of this law. If the Whigs had been the first to proscribe, there would be some justice in this excuse of retaliation; but it so happened that the “boot was on the other leg”—the Democracy were the first to set the example of proscription—they were the first sinners in the premises—not the sinned against, but the sinning; and being themselves the aggressors, they were without the pale of the doctrine of retaliation. If any could take advantage of it, it was the Whigs, who for twenty years had been the proscribed party. We, the Whigs, may commend the poisoned chalice to them; they cannot commend it to us.

And admitting General Taylor to have proscribed in the worst of forms, what right have the Democracy of this house to say aught against it? One would suppose, from the bitter lamentations and heated denunciations of the Democracy, that *they* had never in all their lives done any proscribing themselves, but that the wicked thing had been perpetrated exclusively by the naughty Whigs! But what was the fact? Who commenced the policy of proscription? Who first made proclamation—“to the victors belong the spoils?” Who first shook out the glittering folds of the “spoils” flag? Mr. S. thanked God the dark sin rested not upon the party to which he belonged. In the younger Adams’ administration, which was generally regarded a Whig administration, as in truth it was, one of the purest, and one of the brightest, because one of the purest, that has blessed the country since the days of Washington himself—during this administration there were but four removals, and these for cause. There were not only no removals for mere opinion in those bright days of the Republic, when Executive power had not swelled out to its present enormous dimensions, but an American President had then scarcely the influence to procure an appointment for a friend; for it is well known that when on a certain occasion Mr. Adams applied to his Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Southard, for a midshipman’s warrant for a young friend, whom he desired to serve, he was informed by his Secretary there was no vacancy, and that the appointment could not be had. Truly were these, said Mr. S., the pure days of the Republic! An oasis it was in the desert of party—and contemplating, as he often did, this green spot in his country’s history, he often thought of a prophetic declaration of Mr. Sergeant, made on the floor of the House of Representatives when vindicating Mr. Adams’ administration from the charge of extravagance, “that he expected to live to see the day when the era of John Quincy Adams’ administration would be looked back to as the pure days of the Republic.”

It was in the administration of General Jackson that the foundation of the proscriptive system was laid. Then for the first time within fifty years,—evil hour it was for the Republic,—was the spoils flag given to the breeze. Every foreign minister, every marshal and district attorney, every officer of any note, that did not agree in sentiment with the administration, was displaced. No abilities however commanding, no virtues however shining, no consideration of humanity however touching, availed to arrest the ruthless hand of proscription.

Under Mr. Van Buren, there was no change of policy. In General Harrison’s short reign, there were, he frankly confessed, some removals;

but that, if any did, presented really a case for the operation of the rule of retaliation. The sweeping proscriptions of the two previous administrations having almost entirely excluded the Whigs from participation in the public offices, equalization—Mr. Jefferson's rule—was imperiously demanded.

Mr. Polk came into power, and proscription was onward still, and at rapid pace. But few Whigs were appointed to office. He (Mr. S.) had never heard of but one, a Mr. Childress, who had gone to Secretary Walker with strong democratic recommendations, made himself agreeable to the secretary, got on the blind side of his excellency, and finally received the promise of an appointment. But the democratic secretary, learning that Childress had the sin of Whiggery resting upon him, and being doubtless rapped over the knuckles for appointing a Whig to office, addressed a private note to Mr. C., informing him that his appointment was recalled, and gently intimating that had he, Mr. Walker, known that he, Childress, was a Whig, such an appointment would never have been dreamed of!

To exhibit to what extent political opinion and partisan service were made the tests of fitness for public trust, and to shew the exclusiveness of democratic occupation of the offices of the country, he begged leave to refer to certain democratic authorities in the premises. Prominent among these stood the letter of Mr. Walker, just referred to. It is, said Mr. S., a precious document, worthy of quotation, *verbatim et literatim*. And here it is:

[NOT OFFICIAL.]

MAY 4, 1846.

Dear Sir,—On Saturday last, I directed your appointment to be made out. Since that period, it has been made known to me, that you are, and always have been, a Whig. This was very unexpected intelligence to me. You never did represent yourself to me as a Democrat; but I took it for granted that such was the fact. It is impossible for me to make the removal contemplated, for the purpose of appointing a Whig. I have felt constrained, therefore, to revoke the order for your appointment.

I regret this occurrence very much. Our short acquaintance had made a strong impression on my mind in your favor; and I still believe that personally you are entitled to my respect and esteem; but under the circumstances, I cannot make the removal and appointment as intended.

I take pleasure in saying that your deportment throughout has been correct and honorable.

Yours, very respectfully,

R. J. WALKER.

JAMES L. CHILDRESS, ESQ.

Not less rich is the following from Wm. J. Brown, late assistant postmaster general, of free soil memory, written to a postmaster in N. York, who had seen fit to abandon the democratic party, who for that abandonment had been turned out of office, and who had the simplicity to remonstrate with the postmaster general for turning him out for an honest change of opinion. This, too, deserves the commemoration of a literal transcript:

APPOINTMENT OFFICE, P. O. DEPARTMENT, }
July 26th, 1848. }

Sir: Your letter has been received and submitted to the postmaster general. I think your reasons for abandoning the democratic party wholly unsatisfactory. The postmaster general has heretofore refused to listen to applications for the removal of postmasters for such reasons. But the party to which you are now attached having taken

ground against the administration, and the regular nominee of the party for President, I do not see how the administration can further refuse to act in these cases, without subjecting it to the charge of lending its influence to defeat the candidate of the party.

I am yours, &c.,

W. J. BROWN.

H. J. Sickels, Esq., P. M.

And the Hon. Silas Wright had declared, on the floor of the United States Senate, that "he had no hesitation to avow, and he desired notice might be taken of the avowal, that his party, when in power, would always carry on the government by the aid of its friends rather than of its enemies; and that their opponents, now holding the reins, must not expect to establish a claim upon democratic indulgence by any show of leniency to democratic incumbents of office."

These high authorities, Mr. S. said, pointed out clearly *the general rule of democratic action in regard to the bestowal of federal office. Support of the "administration, and the regular nominee of the party,"* is a condition precedent of appointment to office, party fealty and service the consideration; of course, the appointment of Whigs, has been generally a thing "out of the question;" and so rigidly has the rule been enforced, that the offices of the Union have fallen almost exclusively into the hands of democratic incumbents.

In Mr. Polk's administration, indeed, proscription had been practically carried out in all its shapes and forms; from the high-salaried plenipotentiary to the humblest messenger and door-keeper. It had been carried where it was almost profanity to carry it. The holy ground of the judiciary had been invaded by its foul assault. In that department which is, after all, the first and the last hope of human right and human liberty, of law and of order—whose conservative influence is alone to be relied on to roll back the tide of a destroying jacobinism, on the one hand, and of tyranny, on the other—in which the life, liberty, property and reputation of the citizen should stand so far above the dashing surge of party spirit, that its mistiest spray could never reach them—even here proscription has found its way; for since the democratic party had been in power, not one Whig had been appointed to the federal judiciary; and this uniform exclusion, all would agree, was as much proscription as actual expulsion. It had been carried even into the army, the right arm of the national defence, and that, too, in the dark hour of war, when the best talents of the land were wanted, without regard to party distinctions, to save the country's flag from disgrace. The gallant Scott, the hero of more wars than one, who carried on his person the scars of honorable wounds, received while he bore in triumph the flag of his country, and Gen. Taylor, who had never raised that flag but to carry to it victory and glory—these veteran warriors and tried and distinguished captains, who had covered their country and themselves with glory by their many deeds of victorious valor, and whose names were historical—these master spirits of many a glorious battle-field, who had shed lustre upon the American arms, and whose bright achievements had gilded many a page of their country's annals—these experienced generals it was gravely proposed to set aside, and to put in their stead a man who "had never set squadron in a field"—"God save the mark"—Lieutenant General Thomas Hart Benton, who, whatever may be his proficiency in freesoilism, the very boys would say, was utterly unfit to lead the armies of the Republic; and out of eighteen generals appointed by Mr. Polk in the Mexican war,

there was but a solitary Whig, as if Whigs were less brave and true than Democrats, and unworthy to be trusted under the banner of their country!

Mr. S. said he was by no means singular in his opinion of the ultra-proscriptiveness of the late administration. He could call to his aid good democratic proof. The New York Evening Post, a leading democratic journal, had written as follows:

“If President Polk ever did recognize the fitness of a candidate for the duties of an office, a sufficient ground for appointing, or his unfitness as a sufficient ground for his removal, we have yet to learn the instance.

He not only never promised, but he never gave an office to any man who he did not suppose would serve his political purposes the most effectively; neither did he ever spare one in office, except for the like reasons. Impelled by a bigoted and unmanly spirit of partisanship, without a parallel in the history of our government, he proscribed public officers distinguished for their ability, position, and character, that he might honor men equally distinguished for the absence of all those attributes.”

Proscription, then, had been practically exercised, under democratic rule, in all departments of the government, and every ramification of every department, until scarcely a Whig had been left in the public service. And yet our democratic friends now complain of Gen. Taylor's proscription, and make it the basis of their justification for removing the basement-story officers of this Capitol. For twenty years they practice proscription without stint, remorse, or mercy—for twenty years they monopolise the offices of the people—for twenty years they gather round the spoils, begrudging almost a morsel or a smell to their Whig fellow-countrymen; and then turn deliberately round and condemn the Whigs for claiming just a fair participation in public employment. Done by the Democrats, it is a most innocent and commendable thing; but the moment the Whigs get into power, and do the very same thing, it is most abominable, and deserves execration! The Democrats may steal the sheep; but if the poor Whigs peep into the pen, they commit a felony, and the guillotine should be their portion! This, Mr. S. said, was very convenient logic for his democratic friends—it looked strongly to the spoils—but he could not see its conclusiveness or admire its consistency.

There is nothing, then, in this plea of retaliation. It is all “leather and prunella.” And if the Democracy of the House go before the people with no better excuse than this, they will be reproached with gross inconsistency, and be made to feel the smiting hand of popular indignation and vengeance.

But conceding that Gen. Taylor *has* made numerous removals, there was democratic authority to show that it was right. The ground had been taken, and most faithfully had it been acted on, that a change of agents on the incoming of every new administration, was a necessary policy. Amos Kendall had said, that “to reform measures there must be a change of men; that without a change of men, fraud could not be punished; delinquencies detected; unlawful allowances stopped; improper modes of doing business and irregular practices corrected.” A Democratic Convention in Pennsylvania, which assembled in 1847, had

resolved, "That the removal from the various offices at Washington of every opponent of the National Administration, or of democratic principles and measures, has been long called for, and is alike demanded by the voice of the democratic party and by the best interests of the country, and ought not to be longer postponed or delayed." The Editor of a leading democratic organ—Mr. Blair or Mr. Ritchie, he did not recollect which, but certainly the one or the other—had, soon after the inauguration of Mr. Polk, oracularly declared, that "all the offices held at the will of the Executive, are supposed by the constitution to be reached by the renovating principle in the re-election of every Chief Magistrate, and every office considered as vacant."

And the Washington "Union," of July 24th, 1845, vindicating the wholesale proscriptions of Mr. Polk, held the following emphatic language:

"The removals which have been made have been imperiously called for by a decided and irresistible public sentiment. Other removals will no doubt be necessary, and will not be prevented by the senseless clamor of the Whigs. Justification of a measure is uncalled for, when overwhelming popular approval sanctions it. An administration placed in power by the voluntary suffrages of a free people, and industriously engaged in carrying out the will of that majority, securely rests its confidence in the honesty and intelligence of the masses, and in the present case, is in no danger of being diverted from its purpose by the interested revilings of bitter opponents."

Mr. S. did not refer to these authorities as reflecting his own opinions, but to illustrate two points—first, that the democracy are precluded by their own avowed and practiced doctrines from now condemning Gen. Taylor for making changes of public agents; and secondly, as showing how strong a game his democratic friends were playing for the spoils. Out of power, they abominate proscription; no man should be turned out for opinion's sake; but in power, they conveniently discover, in the constitution and in party obligation, a "renovating principle," which considers "every office vacant," ready to be filled by the new Chief Magistrate, and accepted by his followers as the spoils of victory, and a reward for partisan service.

Whatever, then, Gen. Taylor may have done in the way of removals, it does not lie in the mouth of Democrats to condemn him. They must cast the beam out of their own eye, before they pluck the mote from their brother's.

But while gentlemen excuse the proposed removal of Mr. Heath as a set-off against Gen. Taylor's proscriptions, are they sure that Gen. T. has in fact proscribed? Mr. S. denied that he had practiced proscription. He has removed no man purely for his party opinions.

He has, it is true, made many removals; but it does not follow thence that he has proscribed. Many were indispensable, as matter of principle and of duty. There was that numerous class who had actively meddled with the elections of the country—who helped to degrade and corrupt the elective franchise—who, to use the expressive language of General Jackson, "had brought the patronage of the government in conflict with the freedom of elections." These, on democratic principle, ought to have been removed. So thought Mr. Jefferson, and so said Gen. Jack-

son. It was on this principle Wm. J. Brown, Gen. McCalla and Mr. Burke were displaced: they had left their official posts to make partisan warfare for a particular nominee for the presidency. It was on the same principle that nineteen clerks in the General Land Office were removed in a single day: they had deserted their desks, and gone over to electioneer in Pennsylvania, or had contributed funds to that object. The removal of such was not proscription.

There were other classes whose removal was called for. Passing over the incompetent and faithless, (of whom there will be some in all administrations) even-handed justice required that all those democratic incumbents, to make provision for whom Whigs had been expressly removed, should in turn give way to those they had displaced. Nor ought those who were rewarded with place *for a special partisan service*, to escape.

Numerous removals, then, having been made, how is it to be made to appear that Gen. Taylor has *not* proscribed? He had, said Mr. S., made removals on principle, and principle only—*either for cause*, or towards the accomplishment of an object which had the sanction of Mr. Jefferson, *a fair distribution of office between the two great political parties of the country—in other words, equalization.*

Let us see what views were held by Mr. Jefferson on the subject.

In a letter to the people of New Haven, justifying his removal of the collector of that port, he said:—

“I lament sincerely that unessential differences of opinion should ever have been deemed sufficient to interdict half the society from the rights and the blessings of self-government, and to proscribe them as unworthy of every trust. But on whom does this imputation rest? On those who have excluded from office every shade of opinion which was not theirs? or on those which have been so excluded? It would have been to me a circumstance of great relief had I found a *moderate participation of office* in the hands of the *majority*. I would gladly have left to time and accident to raise them to their *just share*. But their *total exclusion* calls for *prompt correction*. I shall correct the procedure; but that done, return with joy to that state of things, when the only question concerning a candidate shall be—is he honest; is he capable; is he faithful to the constitution?

“If a due participation of office is a matter of right, how are *vacancies* to be *obtained*? Those by death are few; resignations none. Can any other mode than that of *removal* be proposed? This is a painful office; but it is my *duty*, and I MEET IT AS SUCH.”

Here the doctrine of equalization is distinctly laid down. “A just share”—“due participation of office” by both political parties—this is evidently announced as the doctrine of Mr. Jefferson. And the remedy for the grievance of inequality is as clearly set forth—removal, until, by that process, equalization is effected.

Now, I assert, said Mr. S., that Gen. Taylor stands, in this matter, on the identical platform with Mr. Jefferson. Entering on the duties of the Chief Magistracy, and finding nearly all the offices in the hands of his political opponents, and those opponents a minority of the American people, he proceeded to do what Mr. Jefferson under similar circumstances did—to equalize the offices—to make fair distribution.

What else could he have done? To have made no removals would have been to perpetuate proscription; to continue an official monopoly in the hands of a minority of the people; to proscribe, by wholesale, his own political friends; to perpetuate the disfranchisement of one-half of his countrymen; and to award to the Democracy a sort of fee simple title in the offices of the country.

Mr. S. then entered upon a statistical statement to shew that in the offices at Washington, and in the country generally, equalization had not been reached, much less transcended.

On the 30th September, 1848, the proportion of Democrats to Whigs in office in Washington, was, he asserted, on authority he could implicitly rely on, about as five to one—a disproportion most unjust. Now the proportion is about equal.

But suppose it stood now as *four* Whigs to *three* Democrats—would this be unfair or unequal? When, for many years, the proportion had been as five Democrats to one Whig, could complaint be made of a change which should introduce a ratio of four Whigs to three Democrats? When, for near a quarter of a century, the disproportion had been most gross in favor of the Democrats and against the Whigs, could a reasonable preponderance now in favor of the Whigs be objected to as unequal? Surely not; for, under the peculiar circumstances of the case—considering particularly the long-continued and close exclusion of the Whigs—*time*, as well as *number*, is properly an element of equalization.

But, in truth, unless he had been grossly deceived by those who had the best means of furnishing correct information, equality had not been attained, certainly not exceeded.

In the War and Navy Departments proper, there had been scarcely any removals—perhaps not half a dozen in all. This he asserted on the authority of the Heads of those Departments themselves.

In the General Post Office, according to a statement which appeared in the National Intelligencer, there were, when Mr. Cave Johnson left it, forty-four democratic clerks, and but two Whig. Here, surely, was a demand for equalization.

Of the eighteen Heads of Bureaux, but one was known to be a Whig, the third Auditor, Mr. Hagner. Leaving out the fifth Auditor, whose politics are doubtful, the salaries received by democratic Heads of Bureaux amounted to \$47,500; those received by Whig Heads of Bureaux, or rather *the* Whig Head of *a* Bureau, to \$3,000! Here, too, a material change was demanded; yet several of the old democratic incumbents are retained, among them the second Comptroller, the Treasurer of the United States, the fourth Auditor, the Commissioner of Pensions, and the first and third Assistant Post Masters General.

And the Home Department was far from presenting the bloody picture which party limners had painted for it. At the close of Mr. Polk's administration, there were in what now (exclusive of the Department of Public Buildings) constitutes the Home Department, one hundred and twenty-seven persons employed. Of these, ninety-three were Democrats, with a salary of \$117,137; and thirty-four Whigs, with a salary of \$45,100—a difference in favor of Democrats of fifty-nine persons, and of salary \$72,037.

On the first of January of the present year, there were employed in the Department of the Interior, (including the Department of Public Buildings,) one hundred and thirty-eight persons. Of these, eighty are Whigs, with a salary of \$105,650; and fifty-eight are Democrats, with a salary of \$68,417—shewing a difference in favor of the Whigs of only twenty-two persons, and of salary \$37,232. Formerly, there were nearly three Democrats to one Whig, and the former received nearly three times as much salary as the Whigs; while now, the ratio of both persons and salary is only as one and a fraction to one, in favor of the Whigs. This, considering the former gross inequality, might be regarded nothing more than fair distribution. So that, after all, the present Head of the Department of the Interior is not the blood-thirsty butcher he is so often represented to be. He has had the firmness to do justice—that is “the head and front of his offending”—nothing more.

So far, then, as the Departments at the seat of government are concerned, the point of equalization has not been passed.

In the Post Office Department, speaking generally, according to the Post Master General's report, there have been only 2,100 removals out of 19,000 incumbents—shewing an immense balance in favor of the democracy; it being well known that hitherto the post offices of the country have been almost exclusively in the possession of the Democrats.

In particular places, it is true, the principle of equalization may have been exceeded; in the large cities of the North, for example, where the excess was indispensable. There *all* the office-holders were brawling and working partisans. They contributed money to electioneering purposes—to the corruption of the ballot-box; and, according to Mr. Jefferson's rule, and Gen. Jackson's, deserved expulsion. But, in the aggregate, taking the country through, fair distribution has not yet been accomplished. This hour, said Mr. S., the democracy hold a large majority of the offices of the country.

Let us now come nearer home, and see how the account stands in our own State. At the moment I am now speaking, said Mr. S., it is indisputably true, that *under this Whig administration a large majority of federal offices, both in number and amount of salary, are filled by democratic incumbents!* There are the post offices at Lynchburg, at Fredericksburg, at Petersburg, at Richmond, at Portsmouth, and at Norfolk; the judge of the Western district, marshal of the Western district, judge of the Eastern district, attorney for the Eastern district, surveyor of the port of Hampton, collector of the port of Smithfield, (held by Dr. Butler, the democratic nominee for Treasurer, himself a monument of Whig forbearance,) and the navy agency at Norfolk, involving an annual patronage of two millions of dollars, and, in this respect, of more pecuniary and political importance than all the other federal offices in Virginia put together.

And what have the Whigs *per contra*? They have the attorney for the Western district, the post offices at Wheeling and Winchester, the marshal for the Eastern district, and the collectorships of Alexandria, Richmond, Norfolk, and Petersburg! A decided majority of the more important federal offices in Virginia held, under a Whig administration, by Democrats! Let the fact be noted by the people, that at the very moment their democratic representatives here are exclaiming against

Gen. Taylor for proscription, and pleading that supposed proscription in excuse for the removal of our excellent State officers, at that very moment the Whigs hold comparatively a small portion of the valuable federal offices in Virginia! Equalization, even, has not been attempted! What does this prove but that, at least in Virginia, Gen. Taylor has demeaned himself most gently and generously as regards this matter of removals, and that the cry of retaliation which is now raised, is raised without any just reason whatever, and is only a party pretext to cover the enormity of a thing, which, unveiled, would be too monstrous to be contemplated without disgust and abhorrence.

Much clamor had been raised about the removal of Virginians, and the attempt has been made to send forth the impression that citizens of this State have been peculiarly the subjects of proscription. Doubtless many *have* been removed; but the reason is, that Virginia has had in the public offices, at least in Washington, more than her due share. Eastern Virginia, for example, had 65 clerks; when, according to a fair proportion, she was entitled to but 12. Justice to the rest of the Union required the inequality to be corrected.

But the large number of removals made in a given period—that, say our democratic friends, is proof conclusive of the ultra proscriptiveness of the present administration. By no means, said Mr. S. The system of democratic proscription had been going on for twenty years, until there was nearly a democratic monopoly of the offices of the National Government. Numerous removals, therefore, became indispensable, in order to effect equalization. It could be effected in no other way. As Mr. Jefferson said: “Deaths are few, and resignations none.” Removal consequently, was the only process; the only alternative—and the frequency of the exercise of this instrumentality, was necessarily in proportion to the exclusiveness of democratic occupation of office. If it be used gradually and slowly, equalization can never be effected in the course of a single administration.

But it is said, that General Taylor came into the presidency pledged against removals—that he declared in the canvass, that he would be the president of the nation, and not of a party; and that in his inaugural address, he had proclaimed honesty, capacity and fidelity, as his standards of qualification for public trust.

Are these declarations, said Mr. S., to be construed into a pledge on Gen. Taylor’s part, to make no removals of Democrats? If so, he was pledged against equalization—to the perpetuation of proscription, and to the perpetration of injustice to one half of his countrymen. But his declarations bear no such interpretation. He has, violated no pledges. On the contrary, he has faithfully kept them. He has by allowing both political parties to participate in the offices of the Republic, proved himself the president of the people, and not of a party. He has not driven all the Democrats from office, as his predecessors did the Whigs. He has shewn by his course, that he regards the two parties as citizens of a common country, and equally entitled to share its offices of trust. If he had made no removals, thereby still continuing the offices in the hands of democratic incumbents, and still excluding the Whigs, he would indeed have proved himself the president of a party, and not of the nation, and would indeed have broken his pledges.

Nor could his avowal of honesty, capability and fidelity, as tests of fitness for public station, be interpreted into an engagement to make no removals. That avowal had reference obviously to *original appointments*, not to removals. It meant merely, that in *making* appointments, regard would be had to moral and mental fitness—not that *no* removals would be made. There have been, said Mr. S., I candidly confess, some removed who were honest and capable; I know such myself; some of them are my cherished personal friends. I could name one; an editor of a Democratic Journal—a gentleman of the finest talents, and the noblest character, who though himself removed, took a stand on this subject worthy of the best days of Virginia; and I sympathise with these, that necessity and principle, required their displacement; but they were displaced, not on account of political opinion, but in furtherance of Mr. Jefferson's rule of equalization. If competent and faithful public servants have been sacrificed to this salutary republican rule, it is not the fault of the Whigs, but of those (the Democrats) who have filled the public places of the country with democratic incumbents, to the almost entire exclusion of the Whigs. *They* created the necessity for the application of the rule, and are responsible for the consequences. And my life on it, said Mr. S., if Gen. Taylor had, on assuming the presidency, found a fair distribution of office between the Whigs and the Democrats, not one capable and faithful officer would have been dismissed.

Mr. S. said he could produce democratic proof that Gen. Taylor's administration had not been proscriptive. The New York Evening Post, a leading Democratic Journal, rebuking the Washington Union for its unfounded complaints against Gen. Taylor, had used the following emphatic language:

“But supposing that the Washington Union was in a position to complain of proscription, it is effectually destroying the force of its complaints by beginning before there is anything to complain of. Considering the legion of offices which it is the duty of the President to fill, his forbearance, thus far, has been conspicuous; and whatever may be his course hereafter, thus far the democratic party have no reason to complain of injustice.

“He has made but few changes, and most of those have been, in our judgment, decidedly advantageous to the public. When the public service is threatened, it will be time enough for the Union to begin the war; but even then we would counsel that journal to leave the complaining to those who can do it with some show of consistency, and with proportionate effect.”

The simple truth is, said Mr. S., that Gen. Taylor makes removals, as before intimated, on a fixed principle. He does not act, as some of his predecessors have done, on the maxim, that to the victorious party belong the offices, but upon the more popular, he would say, more truly democratic doctrine, that both political parties are entitled to a share of public employment. Upon this republican rule, he trusted the present Chief Magistrate would continue to act, until equality had been fully established. And when that happy medium shall have been arrived at, he trusted both parties, having a fresh starting point, and taking a new latitude and departure, would unite in preserving the equilibrium in all future time, and thus breaking up the spoils system forever. Then may we

return to the purer practices of the earlier Republic—to the good old republican usages of its primeval simplicity and purity. Then, to use the language of Mr. Jefferson, we can “return with joy to that state of things, when the only questions concerning a candidate shall be: Is he honest, is he capable, is he faithful to the Constitution?” Then, if our democratic friends shall so choose, a new era begins:

“Magnus ab integro seclorum nascitur ordo.”

But suppose Gen. Taylor *has* done wrong in this matter of removals, shall we copy the wrong? Because he has proscribed at Washington, shall we do the like at Richmond? Shall innocent men suffer in Virginia, for the sins of guilty men out of Virginia? Sir, there is no reason, surely no christianity in the doctrine.

Gentlemen on the democratic side of the house alledge, in excuse of their course, that they are but carrying out our own rule of equalization, by removing two of the four Whig officers in the capitol. Remembering, said Mr. S., the party ingenuity of my democratic friends, (which has ever been most remarkable,) I knew well Mr. Speaker, that you and your party, would go before the people with the plea, that you are only meeting the Whigs upon their own ground, and enforcing their own rule of fair distribution. But upon this platform you cannot stand for a moment. There is no sort of analogy in the two cases. The doctrine of Mr. Jefferson, which Gen. Taylor has adopted for his guide, is: that the principle of equalization is to be applied only, where *by the operation of proscription*, there is gross inequality between parties, in the enjoyment of the offices. Where there has been no proscription for opinion's sake, the principle is not in point. My democratic friends do not apply the principle properly, and we all know that there is as much in the application of a principle, as in the principle itself. There is, indeed, no difference between a wrong principle, and the wrong application of a right principle. Both are repugnant to sound morals. Now, if Mr. Heath had, when he came into office, turned out a Democrat, *simply because of his being a Democrat*, there might be something in the plea of equalization now put in. But such is not the fact; he was elected to the office of first auditor, in the purer days of the Republic, when a man's personal qualifications, and not his political opinions, were regarded. There was indeed, at the period of his first election, no such party division as that of Whig and Democrat. It was in that most glorious era of our political history, when, according to the highest of democratic authority, “we were all federalists; all republicans,”—when honest men and capable men, not bustling politicians, were sought out for public station—when to ask a man's political opinions in reference to his appointment to office, would have been regarded an insult to the American people, and a degradation of our republican institutions. It was at a time like this, that Mr. Heath was elected to the office he now fills. He was not then a Whig himself, for there were no Whigs then, and he turned out no Democrat, for there were no Democrats then to be turned out. No man was proscribed for him; he ought not to be proscribed for any. He was selected originally for his high merits; his superior qualifications—let the reason that led to his original appointment, protect him from proscription now, and retain to the commonwealth his invaluable services,

But after all, is there any reason for the application at this time of the rule of equalization, so far as the State offices are concerned? None whatever; for while the Whigs have the first and second auditors, treasurer, and secretary of the commonwealth, and attorney general, the Democracy have the governor, two members of the council, superintendent of the penitentiary, penitentiary store-keeper, and register of the land office. And taking the principal offices throughout the State, both as to number and salary, it will be found, after deducting the judgeships, (which are not political offices at all, and whose incumbents were mostly elected before the present division of parties,) that there is already a pretty fair distribution. And if equality does not at this moment exist, it soon will under the democratic practice now invariably pursued, of making all appointments from the ranks of the Democracy. Are any new appointments, legislative or executive, if of any account, now conferred on Whigs? Are any likely to be? Let the candid men of the dominant party answer the questions.

I have thus endeavored to demonstrate, said Mr. S., that the reasons for which our democratic friends propose the introduction of proscription in Virginia, are wholly insufficient; that they have no right to avail themselves of the law of retaliation, being the first wrong-doers; that having, when in power, practiced proscription to the utmost extreme, they are estopped, now that they are out of power, from condemning it in others; and finally, that Gen. Taylor has not, in the true sense of the term, proscribed?

If these positions have been established, the whole basis of their justification tumbles from under them, and they must stand before the people, (if they displace Mr. Heath,) as having perpetrated an act of unworthy revenge, and of egregious injustice and wrong.

But the consequences, moral, social and political, of bringing proscription into our midst—have you and your party, Mr. Speaker, ever reflected seriously upon them?

Have you ever soberly weighed its effect upon the public interests in the constant change of public functionaries which is to follow its adoption? One spring, the Democrats are successful at the polls, and the following winter out go the Whig holders of office: the next election day, by one of those strange revolutions in politics which are every day occurring, the Whigs are victorious, and at the ensuing session of the Legislature, they in their turn, as matter of sheer justice, displace the democratic incumbents. The consequence is, that just as the public officer is becoming familiar with the duties of his post, he is turned out, and the interests of the people fall into inexperienced and incompetent hands.

Have you ever looked to the social consequences of the movement? Have you drawn for your imagination the picture of an exasperated and divided people? Have you called to mind the deep resentments, the bitter strifes, the jarring discords, the burning revenge, the personal feuds, which will be the necessary results of this policy? Have you thought how it will embitter the social relations, by arraying one-half of the community in rancorous hostility to the other? And are we willing to sacrifice on the altar of party proscription the social tranquillity and happiness of our people?

And have we contemplated the *political* effects? How it will degrade every election into an ignoble squabble for place? How it will transform

a nation of proud Virginians into a nation of sordid office-seekers?

And is *this* the time, Mr. Speaker, to be introducing among us the elements of strife? Now, when a common danger should unite us as a band of brothers together—when the rude hand of aggression is almost clenched upon our limbs—when our only safety, too, is in union, unbroken, perfect, and hearty union—when an undivided front is the only guarantee of vindicated right, a rescued constitution, and an integral Union—when but a few days ago, in the name of our endangered rights, we sent forth from this hall a solemn appeal for fraternity and harmony—I say, is this the time to scatter among our people the seeds of discord, irritation and distrust? Is this the fitting moment to rouse up the party vindictiveness, which is to make us an embittered and divided people?

But there is one consideration, Mr. Speaker, which, above all others, weighs heavily upon *my* bosom, and which would bring me on my knees to the democratic party in this House, if that would avail to make my supplication effectual; and that is, that the honor of Virginia is in danger from this thing. Sir, I shudder at the very thought of seeing the flag of the spoils streaming in triumph over the Senate-house of the Old Dominion! My heart sickens within me, at the dread idea, that from the liberty-inspiring banner of Virginia, the proud motto, *sic semper tyrannis*, is to be struck out, and on its folds inscribed that ignoble maxim of Tammany Hall paternity, “to the victors belong the spoils.”

Sir, I call upon you and your party, as proud Virginians, to ponder over this thing. Only think of it. Virginia, the land of Washington, of Henry, and of Lee—the noble mother of heroes, states and statesmen; whose past history is but a series of associations of undimmed glory and bright renown, and whose name was once the synonym of lofty chivalry and unstained honor. Think of it—I repeat. Look upon the scene—Virginia, “the good old mother of us all,” crouching at the low, mean shrine of the spoils!

Let the Federal Government do what it will, Mr. Speaker, but let us not introduce proscription in Virginia. Oh! let us not bring this accursed fiend about us to destroy the sweet peace of our hearths and firesides. There are elements of discord enough among us already. There are great domestic concerns that require all the harmonizing influences we can bring to bear upon them; and around that altar—and not the altar of the spoils—the altar of Virginia—Virginia in her purity—Virginia in her dignity—Virginia in a name untarnished—around that holy altar let us all gather, and send up our mingled orisons for the renewed prosperity of our beloved State, and the preservation of an unsullied name forever!

I need say but little, said Mr. S., of Mr. Heath’s qualifications as an officer. They are as familiar as house-hold words throughout the broad limits of Virginia. In every nook and corner of the State’s domain, in every glen and on every mountain side, his praises have been rung,—the unreluctant homage of the honest yeomanry, who have transacted business in his office, and who have felt, practically, his value as an officer of the people. There is not a deputy sheriff in the State, nor a clerk of a court, nor a commissioner of the revenue, that does not know him as a ready, civil, accommodating, able public officer, and that does not admire and love the man who knows so well how to blend the accomplish-

ments of the gentleman with the right discharge of the stern duties of official responsibility. Sir, there is about him a mildness, a gentleness, a soothing address, an unpretending simplicity, and an easy, yet firm impartiality, too seldom met with in public functionaries, and which make him the very pattern of what a servant of the people should be. You see the plain countryman go into his office—he is awkward, feels perhaps some of that awe which is often felt, and which some make you feel, when in the presence of official dignitaries—your Auditor meets him with a republican civility and gentlemanly ease, which at once inspire confidence, and soon makes the visitor feel that *he* is the *master*, and the Auditor the *servant*. Or, perhaps, his papers are not properly prepared, and he cannot draw from the Treasury the pittance which makes the object of his visit,—you'll see Mr. Heath carefully pointing out the defect, and instructing him minutely how to proceed, by endorsing on his papers exactly what is to be done.

On the whole, said Mr. S., I have never known so perfect an example of a public officer; and I undertake to say, that no man, however humble, or however exalted, ever left his office without a pleasing impression of him who filled it.

Of his value as a public officer, a single fact may speak. On a recent occasion, his fidelity and ability—and these alone—saved to the commonwealth the large sum of \$9,000. And the facts are these: A claim, having some connection with the Internal Improvement fund, was presented to the Auditor. He disallowed it. Appeal was taken to Judge Robertson's court. After a laborious investigation, an elaborate opinion was given by the court, overruling the Auditor's decision, and a decree entered requiring him to issue his warrant on the Treasury in discharge of the claim. The Attorney General happening to be present at the time the attorney for the Bank made demand for payment, told Mr. Heath the claim ought to be paid, for that he had fully investigated it, and considered it strictly legal. Mr. H. dissented, and desired the Attorney General to prepare a petition for a supersedeas, apprising him that it was his purpose to carry the case to the court of appeals. Mr. Baxter accordingly prepared a petition, but assigned no error, because he could not conscientiously assign any, believing there was none. Of course, the supersedeas was refused. Mr. H. immediately called a meeting of the Board of Public Works, laid the whole matter before them, and gave them his views, when it was resolved to employ other counsel, which was done, a petition for a supersedeas assigning error was presented, an appeal allowed, the case taken up, the decision of Judge Robertson reversed, and the decision of the Auditor, of course, affirmed. It turned out that both Judge Robertson and Mr. Baxter were wrong, and Mr. Heath right. These facts, said Mr. S., by no means impeach the legal ability of Judge R. or Mr. B., for on the point involved the ablest counsel differed; but this they do shew, that by Mr. Heath's fidelity and legal discrimination, a large amount had been saved to the commonwealth. They proved, that so far as the peculiar business of the Auditor's office was concerned, Mr. H. was as sound a lawyer as the Attorney General and the circuit judge, and even better. And this is the officer whom we propose to displace for one who is entirely untried and inexperienced!

There is one point of view in which his public services are invaluable, and almost indispensable. He has grown up with all that portion of our system of laws that has relation to the fiscal concerns of the commonwealth, and is entirely familiar with it in all its ramifications and bearings. He has a knowledge, in this regard, which no man, however gifted, can acquire save by years of constant and laborious investigation. And put whom you will in the present Auditor's stead, years must elapse before his successor can learn properly the duties of the office. And the loud complaints of sheriffs, clerks, and commissioners of the revenue, will very soon demonstrate the impolicy and evil consequences of substituting for Mr. Heath one less versed and experienced. Sir, his removal will be a great public loss, and there is not a member of this House that does not know it.

As a man, said Mr. S., Mr. Heath requires no eulogy at my hands. I have known him from my boyhood, and for one I have ever looked upon him as the very Cato of Utica of the Old Dominion.

But there are some facts connected with his private history which it is peculiarly fit to make known on the present occasion, and which, I am sure, will make a deep impression on this House, unless it be impenetrable to every generous emotion.

A short time before the inauguration of Gen. Taylor, or immediately thereafter, Mr. Heath penned a most beautiful memorial to the President, asking the retention in office of Mr. Nelson, then the collector of the port of Richmond. It was handed to me by its author, written in his own hand-writing, with the request that I would present it to the Whig members of the Legislature for their signature; which I cheerfully did, and having obtained the signatures, handed it back to him, and by him it was transmitted to the Executive.

Another case—that of Shinnel Godwin, late a member of this house, whom we all know well, for his warm nature and his ardent democracy, and who had been appointed to office by Mr. Polk. That office was the only means of support for a wife, ten daughters, and a son. Feeling a deep interest in his fate, on account of his own personal merits, and of his dependent family, I addressed several letters, and got others to address them, to the head of the department in which Mr. G. was employed; but receiving no satisfactory assurance, I wrote a last letter, and knowing that Mr. Heath was personally acquainted with the secretary to whom it was addressed, I applied to him to add his solicitation to mine, hoping that our joint intercession would be successful. Mr. H. did not hesitate for a moment. "I will do it with the utmost pleasure (said he;) and the more willingly, that Mr. Godwin once headed a movement for my removal." And he then indicted, at the end of my own letter, a most touching appeal in behalf of Mr. G. The mission of mercy was successful. And such a man as this, it is proposed now to immolate on the altar of party proscription!

If the deed be done, Mr. Speaker, there will be one consolation, at least, for those who do it; for some solace they surely ought to have for a deed so cruel and revolting—something to soothe the conscience—some "flattering unction for the soul;"—and that consolation they have in this—that a nobler victim was never bound for the stake—that nobler

blood never stained the block! But let my democratic friends remember, and beware, that the "blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church."

Some charges have been made. It is said that the Board of Public Works, of which Mr. Heath and Mr. Lawson are members, have been partial in the appointment of State directors and proxies. I am authorized by those gentlemen to say, that so far as they are concerned, there is no foundation whatever for the charge. Of the officers appointed by the Board, whose politics they have been able to ascertain *since* their appointment—for they were not known before—57 were Democrats; 37 Whigs.

It was said by the gentleman from Logan, that it was highly desirable that the Board of Public Works should be changed, and that for this object, Mr. Heath and Mr. Lawson should be removed. Why, said Mr. S., change the constitution of this Board? Is it proposed to put in their places abler and better men? It will not be done—it cannot be done. Or is it designed to make the Board a political Board, and the Internal Improvement fund a political fund? If it is, the Board ought to be instantly abolished, and the fund for internal improvement scattered to the winds. And I warn the internal improvement party in this House, that if such is their purpose, they are encamping the whole system on a mine which will explode, and blast it into countless fragments forever.

It is charged, too, that Mr. Heath is a violent partisan. There is no truth in the imputation. To use his own language, "So far from being a violent partisan, I am scarcely a partisan at all. I think, and talk, and vote, like other free citizens, and that is about the amount of my offending."

And last of all, it is said that some twelve years ago, he wrote a play, which was intended as a burlesque upon the democratic party.

I take it upon me to say—for I am authorized to say it—that this production of Mr. Heath's pen was not written with political objects, but designed merely, to use the words of the author, "as a sportive satire upon the excesses of party zeal at the time it was written," which was about the period that party intemperance was assuming in our country its most rancorous form. There was in it, I repeat it, no political or party design. Moral effect was aimed at, and that alone.

And many, many a fine moral is there, Mr. Speaker, in this effusion of his genius. And I can almost pity the dull sensibilities of that man who can read this unpretending, yet beautiful drama, without deriving from it both intellectual and moral refreshment, and feeling himself a better man when he put it down than when he took it up.

There is not a character in the *dramatis personæ* that does not inculcate some wholesome moral, or hit off some vice of these party times of ours.

Major Roundtree is a faithful representation of a class, too numerous in both parties, who make money and votes by pot-house carousals.

Slang, Bangall and Rowdie, are electioneering bullies, to be found in both parties, whom all men of all parties detest.

The droll Supine, with his humorous pedantry, enforces a manly virtue—the moral firmness that prompts to the confession of error when it is discovered, and to atonement for it by recanting the wrong and pursuing the right.

And in old Mrs. Roundtree, the Major's better half, who was so solicitous that her daughter Kate should be well educated, and cultivate genteel associations, and who so often entreated her husband to expend

on the education of their daughter a portion of the means he was in the habit of squandering in electioneering frolics,—I say, in old Mrs. Roundtree, every man, Whig and Democrat, must recognize a character to be commended and admired: for what parent is there that does not prize the education of his child above all other earthly treasure?

Now, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I am not informed of the politics of Mrs. Roundtree. She may have been a Whig, (for the ladies, God bless them! are nearly all Whigs,) but Whig or Democrat, she was certainly, though humbly brought up, a most sensible woman, for she seems to have cherished constantly, the laudable pride to have bestowed upon her daughter, all those accomplishments of education, which so much set-off and adorn the female character, and make lovely and attractive, the gentler sex. To the character then, of Mrs. Roundtree, no one, Whig or Democrat, can except.

And in the characters of Henry Fairweather and Catharine Roundtree, is taught one of the most beautiful and touching of morals.

Henry Fairweather, the son of Gen. Fairweather, the democratic congressman, you recollect, falls in love with Catharine Roundtree, who though born to humble life, was nevertheless, by the praiseworthy ambition of her good mother, highly educated and accomplished. Gen. Fairweather becomes highly indignant, that *his* son—the son of a member of congress, should think of forming an alliance with the daughter of an inn-keeper. But finally, the noble and generous Henry Fairweather, and the beautiful and accomplished Catharine Roundtree, are united in marriage. And what a moral is taught in this union! It brings up and impresses this lovely moral truth—that without regard to party or family distinctions—without regard to the adventitious circumstances of rank and fortune, which make up the inequalities of life, there is after all, but one union that should challenge a parent's approval—the union of heart with heart—but one alliance that merits the esteem of the wise and good—the alliance of virtue to virtue, and worth to worth.

And I defy any man with a soul in his bosom, to read unmoved the interview between Henry Fairweather and Mrs. Roundtree, or that between Henry and Catharine, when he first breaks to her the story of his love. There is a vein of practical good sense, and of manly, elevated and delicate sentiment, running through the conversations of these interviews, which must find a response in every bosom, not closed to every emotion of generous sensibility. This play a burlesque upon the Democracy! Sir, I have never perused in all my life a production, in which there is more of the genuine democracy. It is replete with the spirit of our republican institutions—republican in all its characters and teachings. Surely, Mr. Speaker, in the union of Henry Fairweather and Catharine Roundtree, the son of a member of congress with the daughter of a tavern-keeper, there is nothing anti-democratic. And if the house will allow me, I will venture to read to it a few sentences from the play, as a sample of its democratic tenor; and the portion I have selected, is that wherein Catharine Roundtree is pleading her humble origin as a reason why she should not listen to the suit of Henry Fairweather, and Henry, by an argument, any thing but aristocratic, meets her objections:

“*Catharine.* Think Henry,—think how relentless is family pride; think of the scorn which Catharine Roundtree would have to encounter.

“*Henry.* You overrate this matter much. We live in a country where the prejudices to which you refer, are fast yielding to the spirit of the age. Mankind are becoming too wise to believe, that to be well descended, as it is called, gives claim to respect in the absence of personal merit; and innocence and beauty are as often found in humble life, as in the circles of fashion and luxury.”

If there is to be any where met with a more beautiful illustration of democratic sentiment, I hope my good democratic friend from Rockingham, will instruct me where I am to seek it.

Sir, the times are indeed “sadly out of joint,” and party intolerance has indeed reached a maddening height, when the authorship of a literary performance of decided merit, and whose only philosophy was a just satire upon follies of the day, is converted into positive offence! Mr. Speaker, this little book of Mr. Heath’s, (which I undertake to say *does* possess decided literary merit, though opinions perhaps better than mine have declared to the contrary,) so far from being brought up in judgment against him, should be remembered to his praise, and be regarded a recommendation. It but shews, that while he has the *talents* to make the best comptroller Virginia ever had, he has the *genius*, when withdrawn by a leisure hour from the drudgery of official engagement, to contribute a gem to the literary casket of his native State.

There is one more consideration which I desire to press on our democratic friends in this house. They have frankly admitted, and it is creditable to their candor, that Mr. Heath is more popular as a public officer; more peculiarly acceptable to the people of Virginia, than any other they have ever had in their service. Sir, it is most true; we all know it—he is even beloved of the people. If the election were put to the popular vote to-morrow, he would distance all competitors.

Now, I put it to my democratic friends to say, how *they* can presume to supersede an officer thus acceptable to the whole body of the people. You claim to be, par excellence, the Democracy; the especial friends of the people; you say that the will of the people, is the cardinal principle of your faith, and the supremacy of the popular wish, superior to all other political considerations. Now, if your professions are indeed sincere, with what face can you go before the people, and tell them that you have proscribed an officer, who, by your own confession, has given them the highest possible amount of satisfaction? And how dare you go before them, with the flimsy and insulting apology, that you removed him because he was a Whig, and for that reason only?

But I trust that better counsels will prevail, and that the blow will not be struck. Sir, let us retain this excellent man and officer in our service. His youth and his manhood have been given to the State. Let us not in his old age turn him adrift. No! Rather let his grey hairs continue to illustrate the post he has so long adorned, and retain in our confidence and service, a man who is dear to the people of Virginia, whose loss will be a public calamity, and his fall a public lamentation.

Above all, let us preserve the honor of the State, by scouting from this hall now and forever, the execrable doctrines of proscription and the spoils.





0 014 442 789 0





0 014 4

M

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 442 789 0



Hollinger
pH 8.5
Mill Run F03-2193